

Researching teaching and learning: Roles, identities and interview processes

JEAN CONTEH & SAEKO TOYOSHIMA

Department of Educational Studies, University of York

ABSTRACT: Socio-cultural models offer great scope for theorising the complex processes involved in teaching and learning, and of capturing the nature of the co-constructions, which are important factors in success for both teachers and learners. But the implications of this theoretical stance are perhaps, not fully recognised in the attendant research methodologies and, if they are, there is a risk that the research strategies which emerge are viewed as not as rigorous as more “scientific” research approaches. In this article, we argue that this should not be the case. We present evidence from two small-scale research projects, one investigating the experiences of teachers and the other of learners, which illustrate the power of strategy which conceptualises research interviews as “structured conversations”, disrupting the conventional hierarchies of researcher/researched roles and taking account of both researcher and researched identities in the processes and ensuing analytical frameworks.

KEYWORDS: *Interviewing, teaching and learning processes, research roles, identities.*

Teaching and learning are social activities (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995). This is now a generally accepted and largely uncontroversial view but, when we consider the ways in which much research into the processes of teaching and learning is carried out, it could be argued that the full implications of such a view for research are not yet recognised. One of the main theoretical strands in methodologies for exploring teaching and learning as social action over recent years has been symbolic interactionism. As Woods (1996, pp. 32-33) argues, this conceptualises teachers and learners as individuals who “imaginatively share each other’s responses” as they co-construct meanings in their interactions. So, their actions are seen as “truly social” and more than “mere response”, and we can begin to appreciate the complex range of factors that need to be taken into account in understanding the processes of teaching and learning.

INTERVIEWS AS CONVERSATION

In order to explore the participants’ perceptions of these co-constructions of meanings, the most commonly used research tool is the interview. Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) list a range of possible interview techniques, from “structured” or “survey” interviews to “conversations and eavesdropping” (p. 153). There is clearly the potential for great flexibility in interviewing, but also a danger – perhaps – that the perceptions of rigour and reliability attached to different kinds of interview will vary. Those at the “structured” end of the spectrum, with their fixed schedules aimed at

producing generalised statements, may come to be seen as more rigorous and reliable than those at the “conversation” end. But this should not be the case. Kvale (1996), provides strong theoretical justification for conceptualising research interviews as conversation, arguing that “conversation may be conceived of as a basic mode of knowing” (pp. 36-37), and refers to Rorty’s (1979) philosophical stance that knowledge is “a matter of conversation and social practice, rather than an attempt to mirror nature” (p. 171).

When teachers themselves are the research interviewers, they may not be immediately identified as members of the academic research community and issues of identity and power inevitably come into play. Relevant factors of professional status, gender, class, ethnicity, language and culture and their effects on the interview processes all need to be identified and considered. When experienced teachers begin to ask questions about their familiar worlds of school and classrooms, Mehan’s (1981) ethnographic concerns with making “the familiar strange in order to understand it” (p. 47) and issues about insider/outsider roles also become very salient. Foster (2004) discusses her own “insider” research with African-American teachers, which – she claims – was more effective in allowing them to speak “in their own voices” than previous work done by white academics (p. 255). Reflecting on her experiences as a researcher (pp. 256-60), she points out how insider/outsider roles are always “intricate and intertwined” and how the researcher must maintain vigilant awareness of this. She also warns – importantly for the research to be discussed here – of the dangers of assuming that the data obtained in an interview constitute an “authentic candid version” (p. 262) of the interviewee’s experiences, simply because interviewer and interviewee share the same cultural backgrounds.

In this article, we discuss the processes and some of the findings of two small-scale, teacher-led research projects, which used interviews as their main research strategy. They explore very different issues; one focuses on learners’ experiences and the other on teachers’. But both focus, in different ways, on questions of identity. In the first section, Saeko Toyoshima considers issues of learner identity revealed through her interviews with successful Japanese learners of English. In the second, Jean Conteh argues for the importance of recognising the identities of “ethnic minority” teachers in mainstream schools in England. In different ways, both projects reveal the strengths and potential of interview conversations for revealing teacher and learner viewpoints and the intimate links between them.

RESEARCHING LEARNING: A TEACHER’S RESEARCH INTO THE EXPERIENCES OF JAPANESE LEARNERS – SAEKO TOYOSHIMA

Woods (1996), discussing classroom activities, suggests that “the teacher knows from her or his past experience that the same consequences ensue as those inferred by the pupil; furthermore, each knows that the other assigns the same meaning to the act” (pp. 32-33). I realised that this was true while I was doing research on Japanese learners of English. I developed a “learning” history interview approach generated from “life” history interviews (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995, pp. 187-189) to investigate how the starting points in learning English could affect learning at the later stage. I am a Japanese teacher and a learner of English, so I am familiar with the learning contexts of my interviews as an insider.

Many Japanese learners of English have limited opportunities to use English outside the classroom, because Japan is an L1 dominant society. This means that many learners study English simply to “survive” in high school or at entrance examinations. I have learned and taught English in such situations. But study for my PhD has helped me to realise that the process of learning English is different for each learner, because we have different learning histories generated from interaction with our backgrounds, communities, families, teachers, peers, learning/teaching methods, personality, motivation, gender and so on. So, I proposed a hypothesis that the starting point in learning English should be a decisive factor in how learning develops at the later stages, and the starting point will be different depending on each learner. Many teachers in Japan believe that it is their mission simply to get their students to a certain level of proficiency, ignoring their diversity. I believe that Japanese teachers of English should find out more about their students’ backgrounds and what they bring to their learning of English. Even though most Japanese secondary schools follow closely the guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education, each learner has a different story to tell.

To explore my questions, I decided to interview adult Japanese learners of English. Each interviewee and I co-constructed our meanings in the process of conversing together “by means of the ability to take the role of the other, put[ting] oneself in the position of the other, and [to] interpret[ing] from that position” (Woods, 1996, p. 33). Thus, the learning histories of my interviewees can be seen as a joint production of researcher and researched (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995). Two interviewees from Sendai, a city in the northern part of Japan in Miyagi Prefecture, about 300 km from Tokyo, had similar experiences of learning English to mine. They had few chances to use English outside the classroom, and yet they believed that there would be no problem going through the high school curriculum and entrance examinations. They also wanted to be teachers of English after finishing their courses.

I felt particular empathy with one of them, Masaki. His parents, who were oyster-farmers, did not positively encourage him to go to university because few people had done so from his home town. He had no opportunity to learn English outside school. Masaki told me that his family could not afford to support him to go to university, but they finally allowed him to go because he was a good student in junior and senior high school. The following extract from the interview illustrates how he had been struggling in developing his proficiency in English, especially his listening and speaking skills, in order to achieve his ambition to be a teacher of English in the future. The interview was conducted in Japanese and translated by myself. The original interview data is shown in the Appendix.

| | | |
|----|---------|---|
| 02 | Masaki: | What kind of person do you think is a good learner of English for you? A good learner of English. Well, a learner who tries to find out what he or she needs and who is looking for the methods that are appropriate for that, or a learner who can even make up new ones by him or herself, or something like that. I can't think of more concrete ideas than that... |
| 04 | | |
| 06 | Saeko: | I see. Well, a learner who certainly does the appropriate methods depending on what he or she needs or what he or she should do? |

| | | |
|----|---------|--|
| | Masaki: | Yes. Well, I think I must include the conception of “independence” or “autonomy”. I suppose, well, we would never be “a good language learner” without those... |
| 10 | Saeko: | Autonomy. |
| 12 | Masaki: | Yes. |
| 14 | Saeko: | Autonomy, well, I suppose you think about this well because you’ll be a teacher in the future, but, well, it’s quite hard..., to have your students acquire autonomy, isn’t it? |
| 16 | Masaki: | Exactly. I can’t necessarily make them acquire that by just telling them to do... For example, when teaching English... I think some students would feel they were not good at learning English, and then, if one of them likes another field, say, music, I would try to let him or her listen to music, [<i>some words are omitted</i>]. Or I would try to let them see English from different angles, I don’t know if this expression of “different |
| 18 | | angles” is good or not, though, because originally we should learn something through learning English, so that means the student would learn music through English, doesn’t it? I would like to try such an approach. |
| 20 | | |
| 22 | Saeko: | |
| 24 | Masaki: | |
| 26 | Saeko: | Not only, what is called, English in textbooks? |
| 28 | Masaki: | Well, I could also encourage them to have interests in English individually. |
| 30 | Saeko: | I see. Then, did you learn English autonomously when you were a high school student? |
| 32 | Masaki: | ... I don’t think I learned English autonomously. |
| 34 | Saeko: | Why not? |
| 36 | Masaki: | I’m sure I learned English in textbooks perfectly, but I believed that all I had to do was to understand the classes and obtain good score in exams. I didn’t do more than that, meaning I didn’t have any goal to develop listening or speaking skills. I was just made to study for exams in junior or senior high, or I felt myself forced to study even when I |
| 38 | | believed I studied for myself. I don’t think I was an autonomous learner at that time. |
| 40 | Saeko: | I see. Your reflection might make you think so... but I think many students are like you, because all of us must study English in Japan as one of compulsory subjects. So, I think it’s very natural for you to do so, or you didn’t have any other choices. Do you think you were wrong? |
| 42 | | |
| 44 | Masaki: | I don’t think I was wrong, but I didn’t do enough or what I did won’t enable me to develop more practical skills, so I should learn English in different approaches with English in classroom, say, I have to acquire communication skills. My ideal is to learn both “classroom English” and “communication skills” at the same time. |
| 46 | | |
| 48 | | |

I was very surprised to hear Masaki's answer to my question, "What is a good language learner?" (line 01). When he said that it was a person who learnt independently and autonomously (lines 08-10), he was using key words which indicate the development of "meta-learning", i.e. learning about learning, and having the ability to choose and use appropriate language learning strategies. This was always something I found difficult to help my own students in Japan to develop, so I decided to ask Masaki how he would consider the issues as a teacher (lines 13-15). His answer was very interesting to me (lines 16-24 and line 26), but I wondered what made him think in this way, as the interview until then showed that his own teachers had never adopted such methods. So, I asked him whether or not he had learned English autonomously (lines 27-28). When I heard his answer (line 29 and lines 31-36), I really had empathy with him. He seems to have been a typical Japanese student, who just accepted the authority of his parents and teachers and never thought about his own learning reflectively. In fact, it made me realise that many of my students were similar. So was I, in some sense. I shared my thoughts on that with him. I was very glad to hear that he did not consider his learning experiences as negative, but was using them in helping him to think about better methods to learn English (lines 41-45).

While conducting the interview, I certainly did understand Masaki's situation as "the familiar" and had empathy with him as an "insider". At the same time, I believe I saw "the strange" in his history and could position myself as an "outsider". Woods (1996) claims that a teacher as researcher needs "to go deep into his/her background in order to explain the emergence and significance of the event" in "grounded life history" (p. 79) research. I felt I was able to go deep into my own background, where I discussed the issue of autonomy from both a teacher's and a learner's viewpoint. Therefore, I was going back and forth between "the familiar" and "the strange" in the process of constructing the meaning of our interview.

The "learning" history interview approach shares different features from many other research methods, even other styles of interview. The researcher attempts to develop co-construction between interviewer and interviewee, encourages the interviewee to reflect on his/her learning and to reconstruct and redescribe his/her learning and experiences introspectively and subjectively. Then, the researcher plays the role of interpreter of the main themes of the interview, addressing the key question of who decides what counts as significant in the research outcomes. I believe that all teachers of English in Japan should be involved in such research to know their own students and themselves better. Through my learning history interviews' I was able to appreciate the diversity among my interviewees and also to discover more about myself. Thus, my research is a journey between the diversity and the familiarity among Japanese learners of English to explore each learner's *self* and my own *self*. As Woods (1996) suggests, "learning" history research should arise from the researcher's own felt needs as a teacher and a learner as well as meeting the vital criteria of other research.

RESEARCHING TEACHING: “ETHNIC MINORITY” PRIMARY TEACHERS IN ENGLAND – JEAN CONTEH

At both national and local levels in England, there is concern about the low numbers of “ethnic minority” recruits to the teaching profession. But we know very little about the issues which may affect the quality of training and ongoing professional development of such teachers, particularly in primary schools. Moreover, their professional worth – it can be argued – is questioned by the wider system within which they are working, particularly for those who are bilingual. Martin-Jones and Saxena (1995, 1996) and Bourne (2001) have shown how national policies and the long-established discourse practices of primary classrooms conspire to “contain” bilingualism rather than open out its cognitive, social and cultural benefits. Any bilingual adults who appear there are inevitably cast in the role of “support”. My own observations over many years in classrooms in inner-city, primary schools in the north of England where bilingual teachers and support assistants – mainly from South Asian Muslim backgrounds – work, have revealed to me the low-level, normalised, almost institutional racism which can be part of their everyday experiences. Bilingual trainees and young teachers may sometimes not be regarded as “proper” teachers at all, but seen as classroom assistants, support-workers, even cleaners.

To explore these issues, I worked on a small project together with a group of four qualified bilingual teachers – all women – as co-researchers. We were concerned to develop a research methodology which blurred distinctions and problematised issues of power in the conventional roles between “researcher” and “researched”. We believed this would offer some of the advantages for access (p. 556) and cultural engagement (p. 566) that Shah (2004) argues are so important for successful intercultural research. Through interviews with a small group of bilingual teachers (17 were carried out altogether), we revealed key issues related to their own views on their professional identities as teachers – what they felt enhanced their success and what created barriers for them as teachers.

In order to highlight some of the issues, and the research processes which elicited them, I will focus on one interview, between Meena Khatoun, the interviewer, and Tahira Khan, the interviewee. They met for the first time one Sunday afternoon at Tahira's house. An important piece of contextual information is that Tahira, quite unusually for a bilingual primary teacher, works in a mainly white school, and has done so for the past eight years. After the interview had been transcribed, the three of us met to discuss it. Prior to this, Meena and Tahira each wrote a reflective piece about their responses to the interview, their roles in it and the issues it revealed. In the following discussion, I refer briefly to these three different texts, i.e. the interview transcript, the post-interview discussion transcript and their reflective writing.

About 20 minutes into the interview, Meena suddenly says with great surprise, “You’re the only Asian teacher...”. More or less the whole of the rest of the time is taken up with a discussion between interviewer and interviewee about different facets of Tahira’s role as the only Asian teacher in her mainly white school. This part of the interview comprises, essentially, a set of connected narratives about Tahira’s life in the school, each of which illuminates a key issue about being an Asian, Muslim, female, bilingual primary teacher in a monolingual, mono-cultural educational setting.

I will discuss in detail one of these narratives. A slightly shortened version is given below:

| | | |
|----|--------|--|
| | Meena | Do you wear |
| 02 | Tahira | I do wear Asian clothes, yeah, I do ...but I don't wear an awful lot... And I must...you know...I think a lot...I don't wear Asian clothes in that particular school because I personally think they will really note the difference .. and I think (<i>section omitted</i>) .. it will make it difficult for me ...because then they really would say, 'you are different, aren't you?' and because I don't want to be different .. I want to be accepted for who I am |
| 04 | | Mmmm ... |
| 06 | | |
| 08 | M: | |
| 10 | T: | And I'm not .. I'm not somebody who's just been imported in for .. for their convenience .. but I do think if I did wear a lot of Asian clothing .. to the school, they almost would find fault in men .. and I really do believe that .. so if anything I won't wear it. |
| 12 | M: | OK, but now and then you wear it |
| 14 | T: | Very rarely would I say I would wear it ... and when I do wear Asian clothing .. and .. everybody notices, .. (<i>section omitted</i>) .. so, to avoid |
| 16 | M: | Are you saying you are changing to ... |
| 18 | T: | being the centre of attention |
| 20 | M: | You change yourself, or? You'll not wear any traditional clothes... |
| 22 | T: | I don't .. I don't change myself .. no ... I don't change my ideas.. |
| 24 | M: | Ideas .. OK .. mmm .. |
| 26 | T: | .. my belief, my belief, but I don't think I feel confident .. wearing them at work .. and my current Head has actually asked me in the past if I don't wear Asian clothes ... and my answer has always been .. (<i>section omitted</i>) .. it's not really practical to do all that if I'm teaching PE and I'm meant to take it on and off .. but second, I don't think .. wearing it, it causes me more being the centre of attention .. and I don't like that .. |
| 28 | M: | Do you wear a headscarf? |
| 30 | T: | No, I don't wear a headscarf .. no .. |
| 32 | M: | Not even at home |
| 34 | T: | Not at home, no .. I wear it just around my neck .. I carry one with me .. |
| 36 | M: | And how would you be perceived if you did? |
| 38 | T: | How did I? ... |
| 40 | M: | We've just got trousers and shirt ... (<i>both laugh</i>) |
| 42 | T: | I don't .. I don't ... I think .. it's just the real negative image they have of Islam .. the fact that the women are oppressed and everything .. you know .. it's .. if it was just one or two people who think like that .. but I've got a society of them that think like that, and I think if I came in like that, they would find it quite daunting ... but I think ... if I was ready to wear it .. if I thought that this is what I believe in and I think it's right .. I would wear it myself .. but I think to wear it in that particular community .. they don't view it as a positive thing, anyway ... and I think it would ... I would create more problems for myself actually doing that .. which is really quite sad .. |

Essentially, this is a discussion about clothes. It is not surprising that two young British South Asian Muslim women spend time discussing clothes and the politics of dress. The wearing of traditional South Asian clothing is commonly recognised as an “issue” for female Muslim teachers (e.g. Basit & McNamara, 2004) and was raised by several women teachers interviewed in this project. Dwyer (2000) discusses how dress has become an “overdetermined signifier” (p. 8 on internet version) in discourses about the identities of British South Asian Muslims. Indeed, the ways in which “Asian” clothing is widely discussed as a (usually) negative marker of identity, not only in academic discourse but also in the media and elsewhere are indicative of how the topic has become one of Gal and Irvine’s (1995) “ideologies of differentiation” (p. 972) which, as they say, are frequently identified in “the boundary practices of non-scholarly speakers” (p. 993).

In her reflective writing, Tahira refers to the importance of the topic for her as a teacher, and we see her belief that the topic of dress became significant in the interview partly because of her and Meena’s shared background:

My code of dress became a major discussion [in the interview] and I was being challenged. I don’t sense I would have faced so many questions about my dress conduct if my interviewer wasn’t Asian. Meena, being of the same religious background, appreciated my concerns; she made the comment that knowing that we have dress as an identity the school actually appointed me!

The first mention of dress in the interview comes when Tahira describes, as an example of cultural stereotyping, the surprised responses of the “white” teachers in her school when they saw photos of her mother, wearing *shalwar kameez* on a visit to Pakistan. Their responses to the photos are possibly part of their uncritical “practice of whiteness” (Pearce, 2003, p. 275) which, as Pearce argues, is a major issue to be addressed in promoting equality and diversity in school. The discussion about the photos leads Meena to ask Tahira if she wears “Asian” clothes to school. When Tahira explains her reasons for not wearing them (lines 02-07), which are to do with not being regarded as “different”, Meena appears to be concerned that Tahira is in danger of losing her Asian identity (lines 16-18). She then (line 20) recasts Tahira’s attitude as a change in “ideas” rather than identity. Then she goes on to elicit from Tahira a sustained statement about the dilemmas she faces, no matter what choices in dress she actually makes. Tahira acknowledges this, but returns to the point about difference; her main concern seems to be that she does not want to be “the centre of attention”. This is followed by a detailed, and one could even say intrusive, set of questions from Meena about what Tahira wears at home. The intrusiveness is ameliorated by Meena’s self-identification with Tahira (line 33), as well as the laughter they share. This is clearly a problem they face together. Lines 34-43, despite their somewhat equivocal content, are spoken by Tahira with confidence and firmness. She seems to accept the ambivalence of her decision, but has learnt to live with it as the most pragmatic one in the situation.

In our post-interview discussion, Meena and Tahira come to different conclusions about the best thing to do as a Muslim woman in an all-white setting. Tahira maintains her stance about wearing western clothes in order to blend in, while Meena definitely sees the need to stand out. Here are two opposing viewpoints, articulated

strongly but with no apparent dissension, by two speakers who have just together explored in great analytic detail a crucial issue to do with their professional roles and identities as well as their private and personal beliefs. These women respect each other's viewpoints, even though they differ. They recognise the complexities and paradoxes in an issue which, though intimate and personal, has strong political and professional resonances. They are ready to accept that there are different ways of mediating the issues of dress in a mainly white, mainstream setting, and to respect the different conclusions each reaches. More importantly, they are able to relate issues of dress to more general issues which can affect children's achievements in school, as a quote from Meena's reflective writing eloquently displays:

The issue about *hijab* and wearing *shalwar kameez* is much deeper, as your position on it indicates how comfortable you are about your culture, your identity and how far you will go to be accepted or not accepted in another society different to your own. Similarly, a lot of Asian children in school or when they are outside home find it embarrassing to speak their home language and will speak English instead, even when they know their mother tongue quite well. This feeling of awkwardness does not come from feeling ashamed about your culture, but how others make you feel about it, and how you are affected by this will depend on what kind of individual you are and what your outlook is in life. While some people will change to fit in, others will not and will assert their rights and demand to be accepted.

Through their talking and writing about the topic of dress, Meena and Tahira reveal their sophisticated awareness of how different aspects of identity are intimately connected to their professional roles as "ethnic minority" teachers – the link that Meena makes in the above quote between her decisions about dress, languages in the classroom and "feeling ashamed about your culture" are particularly telling. They show her perceptions, as a "stranger" in the system, of the ways in which factors of dress, language and other aspects of identity underpin both teachers' and learners' engagement with the processes of teaching and learning and their potential for success.

CONCLUSIONS – SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT METHODOLOGY, KNOWLEDGE AND POWER

In both projects described in this article, we have shown how interviewer and interviewee together co-constructed the knowledge which emerged from the interviews. If the interviewers had had different identities, perhaps the issues raised would have been very different, as would have been the outcomes and eventual conclusions. Thus, our work indicates the need, in studying teaching and learning, for research methodologies which allow space for the voices of all participants. The different kinds of knowledge and power available in research of this nature are a strength and a key factor in the quality of the findings. It also reminds us, as Foster (2004) asserts, that "no one commands the power to know all things" (p. 264).

REFERENCES

- Basit, T., & McNamara, O. (2004). Equal opportunities or affirmative action? The induction of minority ethnic teachers, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 30(2), 97-115.
- Bourne, J. (2001). Doing "what comes naturally": How the discourses and routines of teachers' practice constrain opportunities for bilingual support in UK primary schools, *Language and Education*, 15(4), 250-268.
- Dwyer, C. (2000). Negotiating diasporic identities: Young British South Asian Muslim women, *Women's Studies International Forum*, 23(4), 475-486. Retrieved July 12, 2005 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science>.
- Foster, M. (2004). The power to know one thing is never the power to know all things. In G. Ladson-Billings & D. Gillborn (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFarmer reader in multicultural education* (pp. 252-265). London: RoutledgeFarmer.
- Gal, S., & Irvine, J. (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, 63(4), 967-101.
- Hitchcock, G., & Hughes, D. (1995). *Research and the teacher: A qualitative introduction to school-based research* (2nd ed). London: Routledge.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research Interviewin*., Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Saxena, M. (1995). Supporting or containing bilingualism? Policies, power asymmetries and pedagogic practices in mainstream primary schools. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education* (pp. 73-90). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Saxena, M. (1996). Turn-taking, power asymmetries, and the positioning of bilingual participants in classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 105-123.
- Mehan, H. (1981). *Ethnography of bilingual education*. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 36-55). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Pearce, S. (2003). Compiling the white inventory: The practice of whiteness in a British primary school. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(2), 273-288.
- Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shah, S. (2004). The researcher/interviewer in intercultural context: A social intruder! *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(4), 549-575.
- Woods, P. (1996). *Researching the art of teaching: Ethnography for educational use*. London: Routledge.

APPENDIX

1 さえこ まさきさんにとっての、優れた英語学習者ってどんな人ですか？

3 まさき :

優れた英語学習者ですか。やっぱり、自分で必要なものを見つけて、それに合った学習法を自分で捜していくっていうか、最終的には自分で作るくらいの、そういう、ま、イメージ的にはそういうかんじ。それ以上具体的なことは思い浮かばないんですけど。

8 さ :

なるほどね。自分、ま、えーと、必要な、だな、必要なものを、必要なものっていうのは、何かやらなければならないことが見つかったら、それに応じて、ちゃんとあったものを、見つけてやっている人。

10 ま :

はい。やっぱり、自主性、自発性、というのははずせないと思います。それがないとやっぱり、どうしても・・・優れた学習者にはなれないっていうか。

13 さ :

自発性ね。

14 ま :

はい。

15 さ :

自発性って、これから教師になられる方だから、あれだけ、例えばね、自分の生徒さんには、自発性をね、身につけさせるのって、・・・難しいよね。

18 ま :

難しいですよね。言ってどうこうなるってもんでもないですからね。・・・、例えば、英語だったら、・・・、英語が苦手だ、と思う子はいると思うんですよ、で、その子がもしほかの分野が好きだったら、例えば音楽なら、音楽が好きだったら、歌を聞かせてみる、とか、[一部省略]、違う角度から英語に興味を持たせる、とか、違う角度っていうのもおかしいと思うんですけど、そもそもが、英語は英語を通して何かを学ぶってことなので、英語を通して音楽を学ぶ、っていう、ことじゃないですか、そういう、アプローチをしていけたらいいな、っていうのはあるんですけど。

28 さ :

いわゆる、テキストだけの英語だけじゃなくて、っていう。

29 ま :

ま、その子が、個別に興味を持たせるようにやってもいいかな、って思っているんですけど。

31 さ :

なるほどね。じゃ、ご自分は、中学のころからでいいんですけど、自発的にやってましたか、英語を？

33 ま :

・・・、自発的とはいえないと思います。

34 さ :

どうして？

35 ま :

教科書のことは完璧にやったな、っていうのはあるんですけど、学校の授業がわかって、学校のテストで点が取れたらそれでいいや、っていうのがあったんで、やっぱり、それ以上っていうか、その、音声面での発展とか、そういうのを目指そうっていうのがなかったんで、まだ、学校のテストがあるから、っていうのが前提にあったんで、やらされている、に近いような、自分で勉強しても、やらされている、に近いような、意識だったんで、自発的とはいえないと思います。

42 さ :

なるほどね。それを振り返るとね・・・。でも、だいたい多いと思うのよね、そういう生徒さん、って、必修だからね、日本は、英語が、だから、それほうが自然というかね、私から見たらね、仕方ないかな、っていうのがあるじゃない？それは、否定しない？

47 ま :

それは否定しないんですけど、それだけでは足りない、っていうか、使えないかな、っていうのがあって、それをやりながら、違うアプローチっていうか、そうですね、コミュニケーションも取れるようにしていくないと、ま、コミュニケーションもとりつつ、そういうものを学べる、っていうのがベストだと思うんですけど。

Manuscript received: May 17, 2005
Revision received: September 5, 2005
Accepted: September 10, 2005